



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

phrase a Briticism, or an Americanism. This is a glaringly conspicuous fact. As Mr. Matthews knows, there is plenty of bad Greek in Attic inscriptions. Yet the sinful phrases are not Atticisms. But he won't see it!"

If the collecting of these British neologisms, some of which are not fairly to be called Briticisms, shall lead Mr. Lang and other writers on Modern English (Americans as well as British) to see that the term *Americanism* has also been recklessly stretched, then the collecting of them will have been not only amusing to me, but useful to others. It is not only in Great Britain but also in the United States, that there exist critics of our speech who do not yet understand that our share in the English language is quite as large as the share of our kin across the sea.

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

Columbia University.

GOETHE'S HOMUNCULUS.

GOETHE'S *Homunculus* has been the subject of much thought and speculation. His significance and purpose in the drama have been viewed differently by almost every critic. One of the most recent, and at the same time most surprising, interpretations has been offered by the well-known Goethe scholar Veit Valentin of Frankfurt, in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* of 1895. It is the purpose of these lines to examine and to refute Valentin's arguments and to indicate another way for the solution of the problem.

Valentin's article is entitled *Homunculus und Helena, eine ästhetische Untersuchung*, and attempts to prove that the main purpose of *Homunculus* is to furnish the elements of life and matter which Helena and her women need in order to appear as actual beings in the following act, or, in other words, that *Homunculus* reappears again in Helena and her women.

Singular as it must appear, this view has met with a good deal of favor among Goethe scholars in Germany, and Heinemann, in the second volume of his *Goethe*, virtually accedes to it, by calling it the most reasonable among the many explanations offered. Valentin calls his treatise an "æsthetic" investigation, and thereby intimates that he does not pay attention to the historical develop-

ment, if I may use this term, of *Homunculus* and Helena in Goethe's mind. His method is analytical, and special pains are taken to prove from the way in which Helena and her women dissolve that they must consist of shade, life and matter. Space does not permit me to examine every detail. I, therefore, confine myself to the discussion of those points on which his argument hinges.

1. The second and third acts of the Second Part of *Faust* form such a close, separate unity within the whole of the drama, that a personage of *Homunculus*' importance must needs appear in both acts.¹

2. *Homunculus* has no serious purpose in the drama unless it be that he furnish the possibility for the appearance of the actual Helena and her women in the third act.²

3. Helena and her women consist of three parts: the shade which gives them form and personality; life which animates them; and matter which makes them actual beings.³

4. The reader will not believe in the appearance of the actual Helena and her women, unless the poet show him how they obtain life and matter.⁴

5. *Homunculus* is not obliged to begin corporeal existence at the lowest stage of organic creation and proceed through the whole line of living beings, but he may commence anywhere in the scale.⁵

6. It is an *easy* task for the reader's imagination to comprehend that it is the purpose of *Homunculus* to furnish life and matter for Helena and her women, and Goethe had no chance to make this more plain than he has done.⁶

All these points are so closely bound up with Valentin's argument that if either 1. or 6. be disproved, his interpretation becomes very unlikely, and, if 2. 3. 4. or 5. be shown to be erroneous, it is untenable. I think it possible to refute every one of these points, and I will begin with the last. It is claimed that it is an easy task for the reader's imagination to suppose that *Homunculus* reappears in Helena. A serious objection to this is that there is no

¹ *Goethe Jahrbuch*, vol. xvi, pp. 130 f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 132.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 132 ff., p. 135, etc.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 138 f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 141.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 143; also pp. 142 and 144.

substantial support for this view where we might justly expect to find it. Neither the Paralipomena nor the Letters nor the Conversations, as far as they have been published, contain the slightest hint of it. Another objection is that of all readers before Valentin, hardly a single one has actually succeeded in performing this *easy* task.^{6a} If there are some who succeed in it now, it is most likely because they take Valentin's authority for it instead of thinking for themselves. It may, therefore, seem justified to assume that it is by no means an easy task to believe that Homunculus reappears in Helena.

I press on to the first point, namely: that the close unity of the second and third acts requires the reappearance of Homunculus in the third. Valentin attempts to prove this mainly by the fact that Mephistopheles retains the mask of a Phorkyad, which he dons in the second act, until after the close of the third. Though it cannot be denied that the two acts are rather closely connected, yet there exists no such unity as Valentin surmises. In the first place, there is Eckermann's testimony,⁷ that the Classical Walpurgis-Night and the Helena Drama are 'independent little worlds that concern each other little,' *für sich bestehende kleine Weltenkreise die . . . einander wenig angehen*. Then the Helena Drama, as is well known, was published independently as an interlude in Faust. Besides, there are bridges of thought from the second to the first and fourth acts, and the whole of the Walpurgis-Night differs both in tenor and general character not a little from the Helena Drama. But even if the unity were such as Valentin believes it to be, this would not yet necessitate the reappearance of Homunculus in the third act, because he might have been left behind at the close of the second act, just as Wagner was at the end of the Laboratory scene, provided that the two principal characters Faust and Mephistopheles continue. Hence there is no necessity inherent in the drama why

^{6a} Alois Schnetger, whose treatise on Faust II has not been accessible to me, seems to have considered Homunculus the embryo of Helena and Galatea. If Goethe had wished to intimate a uniting of Homunculus with Helena and her women, he might have introduced the latter in the closing scene of the second act.

⁷ *Gesprache mit Goethe*, vol. ii, pp. 178 f. (Brockhaus.)

Homunculus should reappear after he has united with the ocean.

After having disproved the two minor points, I now proceed to the others. As the whole second part of this paper is intended to show that Homunculus has a purpose much more serious than to furnish life and matter for Helena, I come at once to the third point. Valentin bases his argument that Helena and her women (and Euphorion) have a material element principally on the line⁸

Folge mir in starre Gräfte,

pronounced by the young woman who dissolves in the arms of Euphorion. But was it her material part that went there? Does not the word *Gräfte* and the analogy of the other women, rather suggest that it was her shade that returned there? After thus assuming a material part for this young woman, Valentin goes on to say that the vital and material parts of the others, except Panthalis, unite with nature. But what proof is there that any but the vital parts did this? On the contrary, the women become spirits of the trees, the mountain springs, the brooks and the vines; they are to preside over the material parts of these things. What is true of the other women applies invertedly to Panthalis. Hence none of Helena's women shows any distinct trace of a material element. Now Valentin's whole argument rests on the stage directions,⁹ *Das Körperliche verschwindet*, 'the corporeal vanishes,' which follow both the death of Euphorion and that of Helena. But does *das Körperliche* mean here the material element, and how can this material element suddenly become invisible? Valentin, to be sure, does not see any difficulty in this. He argues it must become invisible, as soon as the shade which gave it form separates from it. But will anybody who is not a philosopher of physical and mental anatomy think so? Will not the ordinary reader or spectator who is accustomed to see a dead body, after life and soul are gone, be simply confirmed in his conviction that Helena and her women are immaterial beings? Valentin, to be sure, believes Helena must be of a more material nature than the characters of the Walpurgis-Night, be-

⁸ l. 9809.

⁹ After ll. 9902 and 9944.

cause she bears Faust a son.¹⁰ But, if the phantom Chiron, while Homunculus is in his glass, is able to carry Faust on his back, why should not the phantom Helena bear him a son of such a supernatural and ephemeral character as Euphoriön? Valentin himself fully realizes that Goethe is all the time anxious to have his readers keep in mind that Helena and her women are not ordinary beings. Helena calls herself *ein Idol*,¹¹ Mephistopheles says to the women:

Gesperster! . . .

Geschreckt vom Tag zu scheiden, der euch nicht gehört;¹²

they themselves call themselves *Geister*.¹³ Finally, it should be remembered that Goethe entitled his Helena Drama: "Helena, klassisch-romantische Phantasmagorie. Zwischen-spiel zu Faust."

If Helena and her women are not material beings but phantoms, shades that have been granted a temporary lease of life, there remains no difficulty, but Valentin's hypothesis is overthrown. The fourth point was that the reader would not believe in the appearance of the actual Helena and her women, unless the poet showed him how they obtain life and matter through Homunculus. This seems to me the weakest argument of all, for it denies the success of everything Goethe has done to attain this very object. Her origin from Leda and the Swan is described twice and Goethe was glad to see Eckermann¹⁴ recognize how this furnished *das eigentliche Fundament*, 'the true foundation,' for her reappearance from the lower world. Thereupon, not only various phases of her early and later life are touched on, but also the fact that she had once before received permission to return from Hades to life in order to be wedded to Achilles. This is followed by the lines:¹⁵

G'nug, den Poeten bindet keine Zeit,

So sei auch sie durch keine Zeit gebunden.

¹⁰ *L. c.*, p. 146: "Der Dichter lässt in der klassischen Walpurgisnacht das Alterthum wieder aufleben, aber in *schemenhaftem* Dasein: soll sich Faust mit ihm verbinden, so muss es *realistisch* lebendig werden."

¹¹ *L. c.*, p. 146.

¹² *L. c.*, p. 146.

¹³ *L. c.*, p. 146. They refer to their condition as "Zauber" and "wüsten Geisterzwang," *ll. 9962 f.* Valentin's attempts to reconcile this to his assumption that they are real, material beings, do not bear close examination.

¹⁴ *L. c.*, vol. ii, p. 106.

¹⁵ *L. c.*, p. 146.

Finally, Faust descends to Proserpina with the good cheer of Manto for a guarantee of his success. If after all this the reader were not able to believe in Helena's reappearance, he could much less be expected to believe in the retrograde transformation of Faust into a German-Greek prince of the Early Middle Ages. If the latter be done without the interference of Homunculus, the former may also, and I suppose it is not necessary to add that the German public had actually believed in a temporary union of Faust and Helena, resulting in a son, for two centuries before Goethe. If, however, the reappearance of the actual Helena is made plausible without Homunculus, Valentin's interpretation becomes impossible.

The fifth point, that Homunculus need not begin corporeal existence at the lowest stage of organic creation, but wherever he pleases, is owing to a misunderstanding of the text. Valentin interprets the words of Proteus:¹⁶

Beliebig regest du dich hier,

that Homunculus may move in whatever shape he pleases, while they mean, Homunculus may move as he pleases. Both Thales and Proteus¹⁷ tell Homunculus to pass through the whole order of creation beginning with the lowest. Hence he cannot unite with the shades of Helena and her women upon their return from the lower world. Yet even if he could, such an impersonal^{17a} and ephemeral existence as he might have obtained in Helena would not have been to his taste. He desires a real embodiment with boundless possibilities.

Valentin's hypothesis appeared unlikely, because it is far-fetched and unnecessary; it is untenable, because Helena and her women are not material beings, because Goethe prepares their appearance in a different and far more poetical manner, and because Homunculus begins life at the lowest stage of organic creation.

What is then the purpose of Homunculus?

¹⁶ *L. c.*, p. 146.

¹⁷ Thales says so, *ll. 8321 f.*; Proteus implies it, *ll. 8260 ff.*, *ll. 8327 f.*, and 8330.

^{17a} Valentin (*L. c.*, p. 134) says, that the shade from Hades gives personality to organic (literally animated) matter. Hence Homunculus would completely lose his personality if he united with the shades of Helena and her women.

I shall try to answer this question by proceeding not philosophically, but historically; that is, by tracing the development of Homunculus and the second act in Goethe's mind.

The first document we have to consider is the outline of a continuation of the First Part of Faust which was destined for publication in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*¹⁸ and as Dr. Fresenius of Weimar has proved to me conclusively, was written in 1816. Here Homunculus does not appear at all. In an undated sketch,¹⁹ Wagner is trying to produce a Homunculus, but this episode is in no way connected with the Classical Walpurgis-Night. Only in a draft of the announcement of the Helena Drama in *Kunst und Alterthum*,²⁰ Homunculus becomes one of the characters of the Walpurgis-Night, yet he is still entirely different from the form in which we know him. Wagner has completed him before the visit of Faust and Mephistopheles. In the moment when they enter the laboratory, Homunculus bursts his retort and appears in the shape of a well-formed dwarf. He contains a general historical world calendar, and hence knows among many other things also of the Classical Walpurgis-Night. Faust, Mephistopheles, Homunculus and Wagner go together to Thessaly. On the way, Homunculus lets out a vast array of historical and geographical notes, referring to the countries over which they pass. In Greece numerous sphinxes and all the other monsters of Classical Antiquity, confound minds and senses. Still the travellers pay comparatively little attention to the turmoil. Homunculus is bent upon collecting phosphorescent material for a chemical woman (probably in order to marry her). Then we lose sight of him. A scene by the sea takes place, but not on the stage. Mephistopheles makes a treaty with Enyo. Faust has a conversation with Chiron, is carried to Manto and descends with her to Proserpina. The latter is touched and gives her consent to the release of Helena. The judges allow her to return to life, but, as in the case of Achilles, only in a limited locality.

The next stage is represented by an undated

*Schema*²¹ which cannot be later than January, 1830. It resembles much more the second act as we have it. The shell-chariot of Venus, Tritons, Naiads, Telchines, Cabiri, indicate that the scene by the sea was then planned more definitely. Nereus and Proteus, however, are not mentioned yet. Even Homunculus does not occur at all, perhaps because Goethe was just transforming him in his mind, and had not yet decided on the details of the use he was going to make of him. Faust's ride to Manto and descent to Hades are last as before.

The latest sketch is dated February 6th, 1830,²² that is from a time when half²³ of the Walpurgis-Night was actually completed and had been read to Eckermann. Now Nereus and Proteus, Thales and Homunculus appear in the scene by the sea, but Faust's ride to Manto and descent to Proserpina still form the end of the act. Less than five months later the Walpurgis-Night was completed and on Aug. 9th Goethe wrote to Eckermann: "ich vermelde, dass die Classische Walpurgisnacht zu Stande gekommen oder vielmehr ins Gränzenlose ausgelaufen ist."²⁴

Why did Goethe transfer the first part of the last scene, that is the introduction of Faust to Manto, to the close of the first third of the Walpurgis-Night, and why did he omit the scene in Hades? A discussion of the first question has not come to my notice; the answer to the other has often been that he found the pleading before Proserpina too difficult to write. To be sure, Goethe considered it difficult,²⁵ but was there not a much stronger reason for not writing it? Is not the present conclusion of the Walpurgis-Night so grand that it must form the close of the act because everything following would appear weak and unsatisfactory? If this be correct, the answers to our questions are these: Artistic reasons forbade that the ride to Manto and the pleading in Hades should follow after the present closing scene. The ride to the priestess could suitably be transposed, and inserted where we

²¹ Ibid., p. 215, no. 124. ²² Ibid., p. 216, no. 125.

²³ Eckermann, *l. c.*, vol. ii, p. 123.

²⁴ Goethe's Werke, vol. xv, 2, p. 9, June 25th 'Walpurgisnacht völlig abgeschlossen.'

²⁵ Eckermann, *l. c.*, vol. I, p. 201.

¹⁸ Goethe's Werke, Weimar Edition, vol. xv, 2, pp. 173 ff., No. 63.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 189 f., no. 99. ²⁰ Ibid., pp. 198 ff., no. 123.

find it now; the pleading before Proserpina did not admit of any transfer and, for that reason, had to be abandoned altogether.

Homunculus continues to give evidence of a large store of information, especially on Classical subjects, otherwise he is radically changed. From a chemical dwarf he has been transformed into what Goethe, according to the Aristotelian *ἐντελεχεία*, was pleased to call an "Entelechie."²⁶ He has become pure spirit, or life as distinct from matter and all corporeal existence. In order to follow his course intelligently, and to determine his real purpose and significance beyond that of a guide of Faust and Mephistopheles to Thessaly, we have to cast a glance upon the whole of the Classical Walpurgis-Night. It is distinctly divided into three parts. Part i, ll. 7005-7494: Development of the Greek ideal of beauty from the semi-human forms of foreign and early civilization. Faust is the principal character. He seeks Helena, the embodiment of Greek beauty among men. Part ii, ll. 7495-8033: Development of the earth. Mephistopheles, the partisan of the Plutonists is the chief figure. He finds the consummation of ugliness in the Phorkyads and dons their shape. Part iii, ll. 8034-8487: Development of organic life from the sea. Homunculus is the most important personage. He seeks and obtains corporeal existence. What has this last scene to do with the whole of Faust and with the Helena drama? With Faust? The motto of Faust and its poet is: "Humani nihil a me alienum puto." And, as was indicated above, the topic of the whole Walpurgis-Night is development. With Helena? There is so unspeakable a grace and beauty both in the general character and in the details of this scene, that there could not be a more fitting preparation of the reader's *Stimmung* for the appearance of Helena in the following act.

As an *ἐντελεχεία*, Homunculus naturally has a bias for that which his creator valued most, for Classical beauty and organic development of nature; his zeal for activity is inherent in his character as an *ἐντελεχεία* and at the same time, thoroughly congenial to his maker. He thus naturally reminds us of Goe-

²⁶ Ibid., vol. iii, p. 161; also vol. ii, p. 266. Bayard Taylor, *Faust Translated*, vol. ii, p. 372.

the himself traveling in Italy, enthused by the revelations of ancient beauty and his growing insight into the secrets of nature. On closer examination, however, it will be seen that Homunculus is comparatively little concerned about mythology and art, while he is intensely interested in nature. He does not know where Helena is and leaves it to Faust alone to find her, while he himself is seeking to penetrate the secrets of corporeal development. On land he does not find anything that is congenial to him, but as soon as he reaches the sea he feels that he is in his element and that he is about to detect the dot upon the *I*²⁷ for which he set out. The main purpose of Homunculus, therefore, is not to represent Humanism or the growth of Goethe's poetical genius, but to embody one of his long-cherished scientific ideas, the grand idea of evolution.

If anyone should doubt this on the ground that Goethe did not attach importance enough to a scientific question in order to glorify it in such a way, let him remember that several hundred lines in the second and fourth acts refer to geological problems, and that only a few weeks after the Classical Walpurgis-Night was finished, there occurred that memorable visit of Soret to Goethe²⁸ when Soret was dumfounded because he saw Goethe so deeply absorbed in the biological dispute between Cuvier and St. Hilaire, that he was completely indifferent to the July Revolution.

Truly marvelous is the art with which Goethe has united the mythological world of the sea with the natural charm of the element, and the modern ideas of science. Proteus, the ancient god of transformation, carries Homunculus, the modern representative of evolution, out into the sea where all life begins. The fire of Homunculus, who unites with the sea, suggests to the poet the flame of Eros,²⁹ whom Greek cosmogonies place as a moving force at the beginning of all things. The dithyrambic pæan of Thales to the Ocean³⁰

²⁷ l. 6994. The dot upon the *I* would be the secret of creation according to the theory of evolution as contrasted with former unsatisfactory and mechanical theories.

²⁸ Eckermann, *l. c.*, vol. iii, pp. 233 f.

²⁹ ll. 8479 f.; Taylor, *l. c.*, p. 412. *Goethe's Werke*, vol. i, p. 329, *Venetianisches Epigramm*, no. 95.

³⁰ Ibid., ll. 8432-8443.

is inspired by the beauty of Galatea^{30a} and her sisters, for the beautiful and the true are one and the same in Goethe's mind. In him the present and the past, mythology, nature and science, do not conflict but combine in a higher unity and harmony. Unless old archæological proclivities and a recent sail past the mouth of Peneus, unduly prejudice me in favor of the last scene of the Walpurgis-Night, I should like to class it among the highest and most poetic creations of Goethe's genius, nor do I know of a nobler purpose for Homunculus than to stand for the embodiment of one of the most dearly cherished and grandest ideas of his creator. Homunculus was not made for the sake of furnishing life and matter for the phantoms of a day who had no need of him, but for the infinite and with infinite possibilities. I repeat in closing the words of Goethe to Eckermann, "Ich vermelde dass die Classische Walpurgisnacht zu Stande gekommen oder vielmehr ins Gränzenlose ausgelaufen ist."

A. GERBER.

Earlham College.

THEODOR MÜEGGE: AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY.

CRITICS generally concede that Theodor Mügge was a romance-writer of no mean rank. His works, though lacking in originality, are fascinating and of a pleasing realism. They describe the struggles for freedom of enslaved races in foreign countries, such as the Blacks upon the island of Hayti (cf. *Toussaint*) or the Finnish tribes in Norway and Russia (cf. *Afraja* and *Erich Randal*). Mügge's stories are brightened by idealistic types of sturdy manhood and heroic womanhood, they are adorned with highly colored descriptions of natural scenery, they possess the features characteristic of the best of the German exotic romances.

The popular judgment upon Mügge's works has been even more favorable than the critical estimate; one of his books, *Afraja*, reached

^{30a} A visit to Rome, made after the completion of this article, has revealed to me the supreme importance of Raphael's Galatea for the conception and tenor of the whole closing scene. Schröder's latest edition of *Faust II* appeared too late to be consulted.

a sale of fifteen thousand copies, a number then considered exceptional in Germany.

In view of the fact that this popularity has by no means ceased at the present day, we should naturally suppose that public curiosity would long ago have ferreted out the details of the author's life. But that has not been the case.

Having recently, on the bypaths of another literary problem, been led to inquire more deeply into the life of Theodor Mügge, I was disappointed in not being able to find any biographical material in the Royal Library of Berlin, or in other German libraries. Further investigation showed that nothing has been written on the life of this important author, except the scant notices contained in cyclopædias of biography. The one giving the best account is to be found in the *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*; it was written by Dr. Julius Riffert, who stated, upon inquiry, that beyond this he was not cognizant of any additional sources of information concerning the life of Mügge.

The facts about Mügge's career generally known, are these: Born in 1806, in the city of Berlin, he entered the university of his native city in his twentieth year, after being engaged in various pursuits. He first came into prominence in 1830 through the publication of two political pamphlets, which displeased the Prussian powers in such wise as perpetually to ruin his chances for employment in the government service. He then devoted himself to letters for a livelihood, published his first novel, *Der Chevalier*, in 1835, which was followed by *Die Vendéerin* in 1837; during this time he also contributed to many political journals. In 1848, he was one of the founders of the Berlin *Nationalzeitung*, the *Feuilleton* of which he edited for several years. When he left this post, he labored exclusively at his literary works, which were published as follows: *Der Vogt von Sylt*, 1851; *Der Majorats-herr*, 1853; *Afraja*, 1854; *Erich Randal*, 1856; *Leben und Lieben in Norwegen*, 1858; *Der Prophet*, 1860. Theodor Mügge died suddenly, February 18, 1861, being at the prime of life, and at the height of his fame.

Hoping to be placed in communication with relatives or friends of the deceased author,